

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/009,002	BUKH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Zachariah Lucas	1648	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) Zachariah Lucas.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Nancy W. Vensko.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 12 June 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

NA

**Claims discussed:**

NA

**Prior art documents discussed:**

NA

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*The Examiner called Applicant to request permission to amend the application to relate the priority information in the application. It was agreed that a sentence describing the priority information would be added to the application by Examiner's Amendment.*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 6/12/06  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/009,002	BUKH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Zachariah Lucas	1648	

**All Participants:**

(1) Zachariah Lucas.

(2) Nancy W. Vensko.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 31 May 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

NA

**Claims discussed:**

1, 17, 18

**Prior art documents discussed:**

NA

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner indicated that the claims would be in allowable condition if the following amendments were made: In claim 1, the Examiner indicated that the phrase "is encoded by" in line 3 of the claim should be replaced by - - includes- - to clarify that the 3'UTR of the virus includes each of the three domains identified on pages 25-26 of the application, rather than including only the newly identified 3' 259 nucleotides. In claims 17 and 18, the Examiner indicated that the claim language "a suitable amount of" should be cancelled as it is not clear what the amount should be suitable for. The Applicant agreed to the amendments, and indicated that an Examiner's Amendment would be acceptable.